

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Examiner Balli is thanked for indicating that Claims 27-29 define allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Responsive thereto, Claims 16, 17 and 22 are rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of Claims 27-29, respectively. Claims 27-29 have thus been canceled. Claims 18-21 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent Claims 16, 17 and 22.

As set forth above, Claim 23 is amended to include the recitation that "each filter performs detection in a partial area of the image, the specified pattern being detected when a preset combination of filters detects a portion of the pattern," and Claim 24 is amended to recite "filters that each perform detection in a partial area of the image, the specified pattern being detected when a preset combination of the filters detects a portion of the pattern." That subject matter is similar to the allowable subject matter of Claims 27 and 28. Likewise, Claim 26 has been amended to recite the method step of "performing detection in a partial area of the image with filters, and detecting the specified pattern when a preset combination of the filters detects a portion of the pattern," similar to the allowable subject matter of Claim 29. Applicant respectfully contends that these amendments do not present any new issues or require any further search on the part of the Examiner due to the similarity of the newly added features and the features previously searched and indicated by the Examiner to be allowable.

Applicant respectfully contends that none of the cited documents disclose subject matter relating to detection of a specified pattern when a preset combination of filters detects a portion of the pattern. As explained in the specification, this detection feature helps to allow for reduction of memory access times to detect a mark at high speed by allowing for a decreased resolution of the image. See, for example, page 4, lines 21-23 of the present application. Claim 25 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependence from allowable independent Claim 24.

For the reasons stated above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such is requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner feel that a teleconference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
(INCLUDING ATTORNEYS FROM BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS)

Date: December 20, 2005

By: Kevin Brayton McGoff
Kevin Brayton McGoff
Registration No. 53,297

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620